

REMARKS

The final Office Action of March 21, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto.

Claims 1-8 and 12-16 have been cancelled. Claim 17 has been added. Claims 9-11 and 17 are pending in the application. No new matter has been entered.

Rejection of the Claims Over Anderson et al.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) over Anderson et al. Applicants traverse.

Claim 9 recites:

“ designating a patient;
designating a type of information to be associated with said patient;
transmitting said designations over the Internet to a remote web server
which is connected to a database server;
receiving a form for receiving said type of information;
populating said form;
transmitting at least the information populated on said form to said remote
web server, which forwards the information to said database server.”

Claim 17 recites:

“ designating a patient;
designating a type of information to be associated with said patient;
transmitting from said web-based client said designations over the Internet
to a remote web server, which is connected to a database server;
receiving a form from said remote web server for receiving said type of
information in response to said transmitting step, said form selected from a
plurality of forms based on said type of information;
at said web-based client, populating said form with information relating to

said patient;

transmitting at least the information populated on said form to said remote web server, which forwards the information to said database server.”

Anderson et al. discloses a system for encrypting and signing a document and transmitting the encrypted and signed document to other entities. In the medical field, Anderson discloses a doctor creating, signing and forwarding a medical record to others, for example, for insurance processing or prescription filling. See the Abstract; Figures 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, and 38; and the related description in columns 2, 7, 9-15, 18-20, 30, 34-35, and 37-40.

In contrast to the above claims, Anderson shows local form generation in the PCMCIA card. There is nothing in Anderson that discloses generating a form remotely and sending it to a client. In particular, Anderson emphasizes the fraud protection benefits of having a form generated locally on a secure PCMCIA card. Further, there is no variety in the types of forms provided to the client based on the type of information to be entered for the patient. Rather, Anderson merely mentions a form for a check, a mortgage agreement, or other singular examples for a given environment.

With respect to downloading a form, the Examiner relies on the second doctor's ability to add a signature or additional information to the first doctor's record to show the claimed reception and completion of a form. In contrast, the claim calls for receiving a form based on 1) the patient and 2) type of information to be entered.

Anderson only discloses the first doctor sending the doctor's report to the second doctor. The second doctor has no control (according to Anderson) or which patient or type of information is to be added as criteria for which form to receive.

Because Anderson fails to disclose these recitations, claims 9 and 17 are allowable over Anderson.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for

Appln. No.: 09/873,394
Amendment dated April 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2006

allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3184.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: April 16, 2007

By: /Christopher R. Glembocki/
Christopher R. Glembocki
Registration No. 38,800

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001